



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,514	08/19/2003	James Bracken	ER1-0001US	4508
29150 7590 01/29/2010 LEE & HAYES, PLLC 601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 1400 SPOKANE, WA 99201				
EXAMINER				
CHAMPAGNE, LUNA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3627				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/20/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/643,514

Applicant(s)

BRACKEN ET AL.

Examiner

LUNA CHAMPAGNE

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33-37, 39-44 and 77 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33-37, 39-44, 77 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to Applicant's correspondence received on 10/06/09. Claims 1-32, 38, 45-76 are cancelled. Claims 33-37, 39-44 and 77 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

The rejection under 35 USC 101 is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 33, 37, 40, 41, 43, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Marcial et al (7,340,421 B1), in view of Princen (2005/0131780 A1).
3. Re claim 33 Marcial et al. disclose a hosting system for hosting one or more clients, comprising: a central processing unit; a source database to store source data pertaining to a financial account, the source data exhibiting a source balance (*Business Entity Information Section - BEIS 90*); an application database to store ledger data pertaining to the financial account, the ledger data exhibiting a ledger balance (*Subsidiaries Information Section – SIS 94*); and an account reconciliation application executing, using the central processing unit, at the application database to create of

reconciliation documents that associate the ledger data and the source data pertaining to the financial account and determine reconciliation items to reconcile any differences between the source balance and the ledger balance (*Account reconciliation Activity Section - ARAS 96*) (see e.g. col. 5, lines 6-35).

Marcial et al., do not explicitly disclose the reconciliation documents being based in part on reconciliation profiles, the reconciliation profiles determining how the financial account is to be reconciled, by at least, determining how the reconciliation items and thereby how the source balance and the ledger balance are to be reconciled, the account reconciliation application creating the reconciliation profiles by way of a profile creation screen that enables input of information used to establish the reconciliation profiles; wherein the reconciliation profiles define how the financial account is to be reconciled by associating only a portion of the ledger data and the source data pertaining to the financial account with a particular reconciliation profile

However, Princen discloses the reconciliation documents being based in part on reconciliation profiles, the reconciliation profiles determining how the financial account is to be reconciled, by at least, determining how the reconciliation items and thereby how the source balance and the ledger balance are to be reconciled, the account reconciliation application creating the reconciliation profiles by way of a profile creation screen that enables input of information used to establish the reconciliation profiles; wherein the reconciliation profiles define how the financial account is to be reconciled by associating only a portion of the ledger data and the source data pertaining to the financial account with a particular reconciliation profile (see e.g. paragraph 0023, 0027,

0040 – *during the review of an invoice, it is possible for a user to define a new reconciliation rule based on the assignment he has performed, and to introduce this rule into the computer system so that said rule will then be applied by the system to similar cases concerning next invoices.* It is understood that the rule defines how to reconcile the next invoice. The invoice being associated with a portion of the ledger data and the source data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Marcial et al., and include the steps cited above, as taught by Princen, which will result in minimizing errors while reconciling account data, providing an efficient and consistent way of balancing accounts, and therefore minimizing errors.

4. Re claim 37, Marcial et al. disclose a hosting system wherein the application database stores multiple ledger data from multiple different ledgers (*see e.g. col. 3, lines 30-32*).

5. Re claim 40, Marcial et al. disclose a hosting system wherein the account reconciliation application comprises a collection of server pages to generate web pages used in the creation of the reconciliation documents and a collection of object classes to facilitate reconciliation and review of the reconciliation documents (*see e.g. col. 7, lines 24-38*).

6. Re claim 41, Marcial et al. disclose a hosting system, further comprising one or more web servers to serve the web pages to remote clients (*see e.g. col. 3, line 67, col. 4, lines 29-32*).

7. Re claim 43, Marcial et al. disclose a hosting system wherein the reconciliation documents can exhibit financial amounts in different currencies (*see e.g. col. 5, lines 23, col. 8, lines 5-8*).

8. Re claim 44, Marcial et al. disclose a hosting system, further comprising a reporting database system to generate reports pertaining to account reconciliation (*see e.g. col. 5, lines 1-5*).

9. Claims 34, 35, 36, 39, 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcial et al (7,340,421 B1), in view of Princen (2005/0131780 A1), in further view of Bellinger et al. (6,023,705).

10. Re claims 34, 35, Marcial et al., in view of Princen, do not explicitly disclose a hosting system wherein the source database comprises an image repository to store images of source documents; wherein the source database comprises a directory to track identity and location of hardcopies of source documents.

However, Bellinger et al. disclose a hosting system wherein the source database comprises an image repository to store images of source documents (*see e.g. col. 12, lines 61-63 – The check data and images can be stored in files on DASD for*

subsequent transmission to a commercial customer); wherein the source database comprises a directory to track identity and location of hardcopies of source documents (see e.g. col. 21, lines 45-47 – *The Media Recreate backup Program 410 available from Check Solutions keeps track of the location of the files copied to a specific tape volume*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Marcial et al., in view of Princen, and include the steps cited above, as taught by Bellinger et al., in order to keep better track of documents for future account reconciliation and dispute resolution purposes

11. Re claims 36, 39, Marcial et al., in view of Princen, do not explicitly disclose a hosting system, wherein the application database stores the reconciliation documents; wherein the application database stores the reconciliation profiles.

However, Bellinger et al. disclose a hosting system, wherein the application database stores the reconciliation documents; wherein the application database stores the reconciliation profiles (see e.g. col. 8, lines 62-65; col. 9, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Marcial et al., and include the steps cited above, as taught by Bellinger et al., in order to provide each partner/subsidiary with the most current records.

12. Claim 77 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 33 and 40.

13. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcial et al (7,340,421 B1), in view of Princen (2005/0131780 A1), in further view of Ashcroft et al. (7,346,667 B2).

14. Re claim 42, Marcial et al. do not explicitly disclose a hosting system wherein the web pages present content written in different languages.

However, Ashcroft et al. disclose a hosting system wherein the web pages present content written in different languages (see e.g. col. 10, lines 21 -36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Marcial et al., Princen, and include the steps cited above, as taught by Ashcroft et al., in order to broaden the system.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/06/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Marcial discloses an account reconciliation method and system where several databases are used to store financial account information involving several business units. For example, in column 1, lines 50-52, Marcial provides a system for calculating account variances based on pre-determined criteria. In order to produce the documents/reports, a reconciliation process is followed (see e.g. col. 5, lines 49-50). Therefore, although not described in detail, Marcial anticipates a

reconciliation profile, as described by Applicant, which determines how to balance the accounts. The specific creation method of the reconciliation profile is described in Princen, where a user, via a screen defines a reconciliation rule to be applied to specific documents. The notion of creating and having set rules/profiles for documents/accounts reconciliation is well known in the art, as proven by the prior arts. For the reasons cited above, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's remark that nothing in the combination of Marcial and Princen describes the invention. The limitation in claim 77 is specifically anticipated by Princen, in which a reconciliation profile gets created in order to define how to process the next invoice. An invoice is simply a portion of the ledger data and the source data. In that case, a specific rule (a particular reconciliation profile) is submitted for similar invoices. The prior arts cited in the rejection anticipate Applicant's claimed limitations.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUNA CHAMPAGNE whose telephone number is (571)272-7177. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Florian Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Luna Champagne/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627

January 6, 2010

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627